CWG Discussion Document Singapore

Internet Services Providers and Connectivity Providers Constituency (ISPCP) on

Questions for the community:

1. Do you believe that the transition from the NTIA should happen (Please provide the reasons for your answer)?

   Yes the transition from the NTIA should happen to the benefit of the international Multistakeholder community, in a timely and organized manner. However, it is essential that proper accountability is in place before transition occurs.

2. Are you comfortable with ICANN as policy-maker also being the IANA operator without the benefit of external oversight?

   The ISPCP is satisfied with ICANN being the policy-maker and the IANA services operator as long the IANA related policy development is totally separated from the operation. Community oversight is needed to ensure separability of the IANA function from ICANN in the situation where IANA fails to provide services as committed to the community.

3. Should registries, as the primary customers of the IANA functions, have more of a say as to which transition proposal is acceptable?

   No! Firstly we challenge the perception of registries being the primary customers (at most up to 1/3). This is a community-wide approach where no priority should be given to any single part of. Registries should have a major voice in the setting of SLA's for root zone management.

4. What does functional separation of IANA from ICANN mean to you? (this is not referring to having another operator than ICANN performing the IANA functions but rather the internal separation between ICANN and IANA in the context where ICANN is the IANA operator)

   With an internal solution we believe that the IANA function should be separable firstly in a management and operation related way in case IANA fails to provide services committed to the various communities. In addition in order to make the provision of these services fully accountable to the related communities internally a "Chinese Wall" should be established. But the implications of such models have to be discussed in more detail prior to any final conclusions being established.

5. Do you believe the IANA function is adequately separated from ICANN under the current arrangements (internal separation)?

   Yes

6. In considering the key factors (such as security and stability, ease of separating the IANA function from ICANN, quality of services, accountability mechanisms etc.) for evaluating the various transition proposals what importance would you give to the ability to separate IANA from ICANN (separability) vs. the other factors?

   The ease of separability is viewed as a one of the major pre conditions.

7. Given the IANA functions could be separated from ICANN do you believe it would be important for the community to obtain from ICANN on an annual basis the costs for operating IANA including overhead costs?
   o Would it be important to separate out the costs associated with address and protocol functions?

   Yes. Annual statement of costs is considered to be a key component of accountability.

8. Could there be unforeseen impacts relative to selecting a new operator for the IANA functions vs the ICANN policy role (should ICANN determine that there will be another round of new gTLDs, how could it ensure that the new operator would accept this)?

   … The ISPCP acknowledges the possibility of unforeseen impacts. Binding agreements between agreed policy and operational aspects must be a key consideration of any proposal.

9. Are there other transition models which the CWG should be exploring?

   No, the current options are sufficient.